

# **The Knob Creek Declaration.**

## **Differing Voices Within the Movement -- Mike Johnson's e-mail**

Return-Path: 102052.3716@CompuServe.COM  
Date: 28 May 96 10:19:51 EDT  
From: Mike Johnson <102052.3716@CompuServe.COM>  
To: BlindCopyReceiver;;  
Subject: MJN:Declaration 1/4

This message and the three that follow deal with the Declaration that was signed on April 14, 1996, by Jeff Randall and other militia leaders in support of the Constitutional rights of the Freeman and also of all other people throughout the country. On May 18, 1996, I also signed the Declaration when I had the chance to at the Gadsden Minute Men's rally.

I have taken the liberty of making the Declaration itself the first of this series of messages. That way it will be available for easy reference when the next messages are read and digested. The next two messages that follow this one will be taken from JJ Johnson's and Nancy Lord's explanations of why they came to feel that this was a bad idea, and why JJ then pulled his signature from this declaration. The final message will consist of my commentary on this whole state of affairs.

- Mike/North Central Florida Regional Militia

It is safe to assume that any traffic going to or from this address is being recorded, stored and analyzed somewhere by government employees. Any other assumption is \*not\* \*safe\*.

\*\*\*\*\*

16-Apr-96 13:52 EDT  
Sb: COUNCIL DECLARATION  
Fm: INTERNET:TipRing123@aol.com  
To: Mike Johnson [102052,3716]  
Subject: COUNCIL DECLARATION

Below signed declaration was delivered to FBI and other agencies today across the nation. Please distribute to all press and law enforcement. This is a serious, historical document.

Jeff Randall

### **DECLARATION**

Our respect for the opinions of the Citizens of the several States demands that we state the reasons for our actions. Our governments have deprived the Citizens of the several states of their God given rights by ignoring the letter and spirit of our Constitutions, as written by our forefathers and given to us in trust.

We have warned the People, from time to time, of attempts by legislators to take unlawful control of our lives. Some have listened,

some have not.

Our grievances have fallen on deaf ears of legislators, and the voice of justice is silent in our courts. Bureaucrats, representatives, senators, judges, and our executive officers have no respect for the Constitutions which define the role and limits of government.

The Declaration of Independence of 1776 clearly states the terms and reasons why we, the People, have the right, and duty, to restore our lawful Constitutional Government.

Therefore:

We, the People, acting in accordance with the Second Article of Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America, hereby declare and affirm the following:

While endorsing no position concerning their beliefs, we DEMAND that the sovereign Citizens of Justus Township, Montana stand before a Constitutional Grand Jury, convened and conducted in strict accordance with Articles of Amendment (commonly known as the Bill of Rights) V, VI, and VII to the Constitution of the United States of America, to answer the complaints against them. We demand that all the facts of their case be examined without prejudice, with due process, in an open and public manner. The Citizens of Justus Township have given their pledge to abide by the decisions of this Grand Jury.

During the current unlawful activity of federal officers in Justus Township, and in numerous previous atrocities we have witnessed, we have restrained our brethren who would halt this string of abuses by force of arms. With each abuse by unlawful authority, we have found this more difficult. This has also been more troubling to our own consciences.

Should any citizen be injured, or suffer loss of life, now or in the future, by unlawful authority, and/or without due process, or if any action is taken against any signer, their families, or any supporter of this Declaration, it will be considered an act of war against all the Citizens of all the States. We will then no longer restrain our brethren from the use of whatever lawful force is necessary to eliminate the threat of unlawful federal enforcement authority. These Rules of Engagement will continue until such authority has returned to its Constitutional jurisdiction.

Our efforts are for the restoration of Constitutional government. We do not threaten violence to our fellow Americans, nor will we tolerate indiscriminate destruction of lives and property. If we are to restore the Constitutional guarantees for our children, we must use the lawful means available to us. We will depend on our Creator for judgement of our actions.

THIS DECLARATION IS NON-NEGOTIABLE.

Signed,

Lucky Kountz, Montana State Republic  
Jeff Randall, Alabama  
William Michael Kemp, Alabama  
Kevin Terrell, Kentucky

Richard A Underwood Sr., Missouri  
Thomas E Schnitz, Missouri  
Franklin Plew, Indiana  
Leonard M Grummell, Indiana  
James N Wade, Indiana  
James Johnson, Jr, Ohio  
Shawn M Tharp, Indiana  
Robert J Crowe, Colorado  
David E Rydel, Michigan  
Harry Bibee, Tennessee  
Mike Perrin, Tennessee  
John Mason, Tennessee  
Drew Allen Rayner, Mississippi  
Jeff Absher, Mississippi  
Joseph Alan Hill, Michigan Republic  
Arthur Bean, Michigan

The Year of our Lord 1996, April 14

-----

Return-Path: 102052.3716@CompuServe.COM  
Date: 28 May 96 10:20:23 EDT  
From: Mike Johnson <102052.3716@CompuServe.COM>  
To: BlindCopyReceiver;;  
Subject: MJN: Declaration 2/4

This message and the one that follows contains the reasons set forth by JJ Johnson as to why he withdrew his name from the Declaration that he had signed earlier, and which was reporduced in the first message of this series. This also contains some commentary by Nancy Lord.

- Mike/North Central Florida Regional Militia

27-May-96 22:01 EDT  
Sb: Fwd: JJ Johnson  
Fm: INTERNET:PawlRevere@aol.com  
To: Mike Johnson [102052,3716]

JJ Johnson has pulled his name from the Freeman Declaration. To find out why download the 2 text files and read his reasons. I think most will agree with his logic.

PLEASE E-MAIL THIS WITH THE ATTATCHED TEXT FILES TO THE WHOLE WORLD.

#### **THE EXPLANATION**

by J.J. Johnson

After receiving numerous inquiries about the Declaration and the Resolution, I believe Constitutionalists throughout America deserve an explanation for my statement.

While investigating the Robert Starr and James McCrannie case in Macon, Georgia, a government counter-intelligence program was uncovered. Our investigation then went beyond the Macon area, and later exceed the boundaries of Georgia. With all the attention generated from this investigation, on May 21st, we were asked to go to Oklahoma City, to meet with state representatives and survivors of the Murrah Federal Building bombing who are conducting a similar citizens' volunteer investigation.

On May 23rd, we spent the entire day talking to investigators and taking notes. That night, Nancy Lord and I had a long, private conversation at a Waffle House in Oklahoma City with State Rep. Charles Key. At about 3:00 a.m. CST, While Ms. Lord slept, I began writing.

I had no choice but to work at a table with a mirror. I had to look at myself constantly, remembering what we learned, and understanding the consequences for the statement I was writing and the consequences of remaining silent.

The Resolution was contemplated and started 14 days prior. Although I made no commitment to complete or distribute the Resolution, it was completed immediately after a our discussion with Rep. Key. No one else had any influence on my decision or the context of my statement.

At 7:00 a.m. CST I slept in the car while Nancy Lord drove to Dallas for an 11:30 EST broadcast of CNN & Company on CNN.

While driving back to Georgia with little sleep, we found a fax machine in which to transmit the 2 page statement. Later, after receiving many questions, both of us were too tired to drive. We stopped at a motel, and decided to write this joint report.

**>From Nancy Lord:**

First, contrary to accusations, I did not write or even suggest the resolution. When I woke up at 6 am, I edited a single phrase, changed a few commas, and prepared the document for faxing. That's it. I'm really not that good a writer.

CNN called me while I was in Macon to discuss the Freeman standoff.

I always enjoy doing CNN and Company, but would rather have discussed the frightening escalation of raids on citizenry and government sponsored crime than the Freeman. Personally, I do not the support Freeman and have stated so from the outset. I do not feel obliged to lay down my life for any individual just because he calls himself a patriot. And I always argue lack of federal jurisdiction in cases involving vitamins, hemp, and firearms, but I do not see a constitutional justification for this argument in a case of mail fraud, wire fraud, bank fraud, or counterfeiting. Nor do I find a basis for denying federal jurisdiction where farm subsidies have been accepted for the property at issue.

That does not mean that I would accept the slaughter of the

Freemen, or that I have presumed them guilty. A money draft can be legally written on a cocktail napkin if redeemable, but no procedural steps can turn a non-redeemable draft into legal tender.

If the Freeman's notes are redeemable, they may prove so in court. If not, they wrote bad checks and nothing more. It does not justify this stand-off. The over-reaction suggests that there may be something there that the government does not want revealed.

On CNN I started by saying that I spoke only on my own behalf. I explained my lack of support for the group, then offered a solution to the standoff: Have the local Sheriff serve a warrant with a CNN news crew behind him. Citizens will not tolerate the murder of a local Sheriff on national television and the Freeman know this.

If that does not work, just leave, pack it in, go home, send the cameras home, then pick up the Freeman as you would others who wrote bad checks -- at the mall, a traffic stop, etc. Of course this idea was ridiculed by my debaters. When the debate turned to "moving in" my last bite was that they had better make sure the Freeman fired the first shot so that force was justified. (I have been told that the Freeman have declared they will not.)

And in this, I wholeheartedly support them. I am a Libertarian and follow the non-aggression principle: I will not initiate force but will defend myself and others if aggression is used against us.

But my last remark brought horror to the faces of my debaters and talk of "bloodshed" -- previously an acceptable risk when the only blood shed was to be that of the Freeman and not the Feds. I felt the need to be on the show because of the escalation I mentioned earlier, and the early results of the investigation by J.J. Johnson, Robert Starr, III, myself and others, identifying a frightening pattern in the rash of high-profile crimes purportedly linked to the Freedom movement.

It is the "sting gone bad." Government operatives move into a group and instigate illegal activity with the plan to somehow prevent it at the last minute but at the last minute the crime is not prevented, and the evidence is destroyed. It happened in Oklahoma, it happened at the World Trade Center, and it would have happened in Atlanta this summer were it not for the courage of Robert Starr. At this point, we must do all we can to uncover and expose any acts of aggression before they happen -- particularly where government paid actors are involved.

Agent provocateurs trap the unwary, like Mr. Starr, with conspiracy charges. The esteemed Justice, Learned Hand wrote back in 1925, "conspiracy, that darling of the modern prosecutor's nursery." Because conspiracy, to an unenlightened jury, is often proven by innuendo and assumptions. A federal conspiracy requires that the accused did knowingly and intentionally combine, conspire, confederate and agree to commit offenses against the United States.

An agreement to do something lawful, whether to purchase ice cream or defend one's fellow citizens from unlawful force, is not a conspiracy. But if a large number of persons -- say 20 or so national militia leaders -- enter into a lawful agreement, and a few bad apples among them enter into a conspiracy, sorting it out at trial can be expensive, risky, and painful. Ask Bob Starr.

If a person has entered into a lawful agreement, with a large number of persons, then learns that a few of them may have entered into an unlawful agreement, a conspiracy, that person must clearly set out the scope of his agreement and the limits of that agreement. This also applies to even a mere conversation, as we talked about in Gadsden last weekend. That's exactly what Bob Starr should have done rather than conduct his own investigation into the wrongdoing of the Barker brothers.

That is exactly what J.J. Johnson said in his resolution, without any help from me or even understanding the ramifications. Read it carefully. He will not support acts of treason. Think about it in context.

Now he is being trashed by "patriots" on all fronts because he is a man who stands by his own convictions. He did not require the permission of some "militia politburo" to make his own statement. Where are all the free speech advocates who so quickly defend the rights of peddlers of anti-semitic literature at various events? Doesn't this apply to J.J. too?

I am reminded of J.J.'s question on his show last week: "Boys, when you were doing those late night panty raids, who was wearing a wire?" Now, we must ask ourselves the same question: "When someone was talking about violating the non-aggression principle, who was wearing the wire?" Clue: That's probably him right there.

I thought freedom was what we are fighting for. If I was wrong about that, so sorry. I'll stick with tyranny thank you very much.

Nancy Lord, May 25th, 1996

-----

Return-Path: 102052.3716@CompuServe.COM  
Date: 28 May 96 10:20:57 EDT  
From: Mike Johnson <102052.3716@CompuServe.COM>  
To: BlindCopyReceiver;;  
Subject: MJN: Declaration 3/4

This message concludes the commentary by JJ Johnson as to why he withdrew his signature from the Declaration, as well as a Resolution that he has authored trying to put things into a concise form.

- Mike/North Central Florida Regional Militia

Back to J.J. Johnson

**The Preservation of Evidence**

After a government sting operation, it is too often necessary to destroy evidence, testimony, and witnesses that could not only implicate illegal government involvement, but could compromise the integrity of the government as a whole. This evidence is known as exculpatory, i.e. helpful to the accused.

In Waco, the question of who fired first could have been answered with a key piece of evidence... the front door. As many know, this steel door was reportedly destroyed by the fire.

In Oklahoma City, the key piece of evidence needed to prove several explosions (and possible government involvement) was the Murrah Building itself; razed despite numerous protests by those seeking the truth.

Also, the media propaganda in OKC has been so intense that many survivors of the blast and local residents can't remember many of the details that they had observed. How intense? Some OKC victims who suspect government misconduct, were reluctant to talk to Nancy and myself because they were told we were "anti-government, conspiratorial, militia types". Go figure. The mental, emotional, and spiritual evidence in OKC has been all but destroyed by a massive government "psyche-ops" program.

In Macon, exculpatory evidence needed to exonerate Bob Starr and Jimmy McCrannie was reported to a local Sheriff by a defense attorney attempting to establish a chain of custody. The next night, an unlawful raid by government agents failed. Their obvious objective was to confiscate and destroy the evidence. Bobby and Jimmy have yet to be indicted. If this case goes to trial, the government's illegal activities will be exposed.

Now, at Justus Township, Montana, large amounts of evidence and possible testimony that can potentially exonerate the Freeman now faces destruction by the hands of federal agents. By the way, it was government operatives who lured Schwitzer and Peterson to their capture. Sound familiar? Who was wearing the wire?

If the Justus Township siege escalates to a point of no return, the witnesses (and their testimony) will be lost, as well as the key evidence inside, and there won't be a need for ANY kind of court to hear their case. Who will be left to testify on Schwitzer and Peterson's behalf?

If unnecessary death and destruction at the Clark Ranch is allowed to take place by FEDs, and used as a Patriotic justification for war against the U.S. government, then why wait? Gentlemen, start your engines.

...But before you saddle up your gear, there will be those who will carry out their plans to violate the Rules of Engagement set forth in the Declaration, and possibly commit Acts of Treason. Government operatives are standing by.

As volunteers went to the aid of the Freeman in an effort to avoid another Waco, it became self-evident that a workable solution

could not be reached between the two sides. Nancy's advice to the federal government on CNN prevents another Waco (Sheriff: do your job). My advice in the Resolution preserves the evidence (Freemen: get a lawyer). If we are to expose a corrupt banking system in America from Justus Township, the Freemen need to be alive.

## **Conclusion**

We have reason to believe that if corrupt government activity is not stopped incidents like the World Trade Center and Oklahoma City can and will happen again, and we'll be blamed again. Will Atlanta be next?

I can just imagine the stories now. Go ahead. Call us federal agents, sell-outs, unGodly, politicians, etc. No deals were made. No bargains agreed to. No laws were broken. Our mission was to seek the truth, and avoid a repeat of what happened to people like Starr, Mcrannie, Schwitzer, and Peterson, etc.

Due to corrupt federal justice, and confirming the modus operandi of counter-intelligence/government sting operatives while in Oklahoma City, it was my painful decision (and mine alone) to remove my name from the Declaration in order to protect the operational security and unit integrity of the militia movement in the America. Do your own research. Draw your own conclusions.

As we return to Georgia, we find ourselves at the last three words of the Declaration of Independence:

Lives: The removal of my name from the Declaration has caused law enforcement agencies to inquire about my personal safety.

Fortunes: We are all but broke and have lost virtually everything, but not asking for assistance.

Sacred Honor: Nancy Lord and myself are now hated and scorned by many in this movement as well as most FEDs.

But if each of us must compromise our integrity to satisfy the public and "go along with the program", how can any of us ever become free men?

## **Resolution** By JJ Johnson

On Saturday April 13th 1996, I sat in a hotel room with a gentleman from Montana. He explained the situation in Jordan, Montana, as best he could from their view. He later explained publicly that it was important to preserve the evidence at Justus Township concerning the lawful basis for their bank drafts.

It was I, who at Mr. Koontz and Mr Rydell's request hand picked a representative from each state at a national gathering called "Operation Rolling Thunder". I asked each to be at a private meeting to discuss options to help preserve, and if necessary, defend the Constitutional rights of those inside Justus Township. In that private meeting held later at a motel in



Shepardsville Ky, 23 representatives discussed a more direct approach. The mission: prevent another Waco from taking place. It was agreed that the best solution was to gather as many people across the country to come to Justus township and serve as a barrier between Federal agents and the "Freemen". After lengthy discussions, and virtually every military and political option placed on the table, the a conclusion was reached that it was unrealistic to prepare and finance such a large number of persons and have them in place and operational by April 19th, the day we feared the worst.

We then agreed later to produce a statement of resolve, called the Declaration, which clearly outlined our position of the Justus Township situation. This document was signed by 20 persons including myself on April 14th, 1996, and delivered to each signatory's local office of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. at 11:30 eastern time April 16th, 1996.

It was my belief and understanding that the Declaration was written to help prevent an armed assault and to preserve the evidence. Our goal was to insure due process, and safeguard the Constitutional rights of the accused. However, a personal investigation of all the facts concerning this matter leads me to the following conclusion:

WHEREAS Several persons have traveled to Montana in an attempt to reach a peaceful and lawful resolution in this matter. Other have expressed a desire to assist as legal counsel. During this time, there has been no armed conflict between the parties in question. Both sides should be commended for their restraint.

As the government officers have not used lethal force to resolve this issue, it is my opinion that NOW is the time for the Citizens of Justus Township Montana, to work in Good Faith to demonstrate their Constitutional responsibility by questioning the issue of Jurisdiction in the Established courts, securing any exculpatory evidence in their favor by seeking the advice of legal counsel of their choosing, and placing the Burden of Proof on their accuser. By using this lawful procedure, all evidence and testimony presented for adjudication becomes a matter of public record, thus Th) Eliminating the possibility of any loss of documentation or witnesses through force of arms.

Furthermore, although the use of unlawful force by government officers, or lack of Due Process in this matter is unacceptable, I cannot and will neither support nor tolerate ANY Citizen or group of Citizens, acting in accordance with the Second Amendment of the United States Constitution, using the Declaration or any other document to justify or contemplate Acts of Treason, as a policy of retaliation, thus violating the Constitution, and the Rules of Engagement established in the agreed Declaration.

RESOLVED: That in an effort to ensure these ends, I hereby acknowledge my name be removed as a sponsor, or supporter of the Declaration of April 14, 1996.

I make this personal resolution without prejudice or malice of thought toward any other signer or supporter of the Declaration, or

toward the Citizens of Justus Township, Montana. I appeal to our Creator that this issue is resolved by the law, and not the sword.

May 24, 1996

-----  
Return-Path: 102052.3716@CompuServe.COM  
Date: 28 May 96 10:21:24 EDT  
From: Mike Johnson <102052.3716@CompuServe.COM>  
To: BlindCopyReceiver;;  
Subject: MJN:Declaration 4/4

This is not an easy commentary to write. There are a lot of good people in this movement who are trying to do the best that they possibly can for God and country. There are many people out there who are putting in long hours, and some are driving themselves to almost superhuman feats of endurance to try to do as much as they possibly can for the cause. Given that the stakes are so high, it is only natural that people from time to time stop to make sure that they are actually accomplishing what they want to. Part of that process necessarily involves re-examining most of what they have already done.

However, in the course of such analysis, it is also easy to overestimate the problems that one is facing. This can lead to one changing what they are trying to do before anything has been accomplished, and if this sort of thing is done often enough, the end result will be that nothing at all gets done.

After having gone back over the Declaration, and reading what JJ Johnson and Nancy Lord have to say, I have made the decision to stick with the Declaration. This is largely due to the following reasons:

(1) Unalienable rights are simply that. Unalienable. One can not lose them simply because they have recieved money from somebody. The argument that by recieving money from the federal government one has surrendered their unalienable rights is one that is usually advanced by the government to fraudulently convince people that they no longer have those rights. The bottom line is that those rights have been given to the people of this country, and indeed the entire world, by God. The only way that one can forfeit one's unalienable rights is to violate God's laws. Therefore, I do not agree with Nancy Lord that the federal government somehow magically obtained jurisdiction in the case of the Freemen because they may have been recieving some sort of farm subsidy. Now it is true that Nancy Lord may be able to cite 15,000 volumes worth of secular law that essentially make that argument. The problem is that the argument, by violating the basic tenants of Natural Law, is invalid on its face, regardless of who says what.

(2) Even if the Freemen were to adopt JJ's resolution tomorrow and hire the best attorney in the entire country to take their case, there is no guarantee that the Feds wouldn't simply go in there, slaughter them all and destroy all the evidence as a matter of course. After all, given that the Freemen can not communicate with the outside except through the Feds, how would we ever know what had truly happened? I do not see how either backing down from the Declaration or embracing the Resolution aids the battle to preserve evidence one iota.

We have come to a very unfortunate juncture in this country. The federal government abandoned the rule of law several decades ago, and has largely been ruling through fraud. Decieving people into believing that it can exercise powers that were never legitimately granted to it in the first place. However, that does not seem to be enough to slake the thirst for power that those people in high places have developed. As a result, we are now seeing the federal government more and more base its rule on sheer force and terror. To the extent that things are going in that direction, it may be that only force or the threat of force will be able to deal with the situation.

While trying to solve things through the judicial system is the preferred method of handling things, I fear that we will see the government move before too much longer in such a way as to make any remedy that might be obtained through that method moot. If that in fact comes to pass, then the Declaration will be a better method of dealing with that situation then the Resolution is.

(3) I am also afraid that regardless of what we decide to do to try to solve the problems that our country is facing, we are going to have to deal with informers, agents provocateur, dissipators, moles and other assorted unpleasanties from the government's bag of dirty tricks. That sort of trouble will not go away simply because we decided not to rattle our sabers as loudly as we had been before.

Those people who desire a good read may want to pick up a copy of Patton's book, "War as I knew it" (ISBN 0-553-20491-2). There are a couple of places in it where he states one of his maxims, one that he felt was vitally important. It is simply, "Do not take counsel of your fears." It is my not so humble opinion that while the potential problems caused by the various different types of government infiltrators running around are not to be taken lightly, neither are they reason enough in and of themselves to justify \*not\* attempting to define a common stand. Sooner or later, we are going to have to do so anyway if we are to succeed. The odds are excellent that we may see the government moving against everybody who has gone public so far regardless of what they have or haven't said and done. In such a case, we will be in the same position that the Founding Fathers were when Benjamin Franklin observed that, "If we do not all hang together, then we will all hang separately."

So, for the reasons set forth above, I'm going to stand by my signature on the Declaration.

- Mike/North Central Florida Regional Militia

-----  
Return-Path: minutemn@pcl.net  
Date: Tue, 28 May 1996 14:09:44 -0700  
From: minutemn@pcl.net (Mike Kemp)  
Organization: Minute Men  
To: Mike Johnson <102052.3716@CompuServe.COM>

I agree, wholeheartedly, with the tenets you express. I might also add that the Declaration declares that due process must be followed; there shall be no killing, as there has been before. It does not declare war, simply declares our intent to no longer counsel restraint if our enemies do not practice restraint, no matter how foreign it might be to

them.

The bottom line, however, is that I examined the situation then and made a decision. Nothing has changed that would make me rescind my word.

In Liberty,

Mike Kemp

-----

Like Mike Johnson, I was down at the Gadsden Minuteman Rally on May 18, 1996 with two other gentlemen who signed the Knob Creek Declaration. I have not seen fit to withdraw my signature, nor have the other two gentlemen from Missouri.

--Martin Lindstedt, 7th Missouri Militia